

**Attorney Docket No. 20067US**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

MARKUS REITER

Serial No. 10/711,842

Filed: October 8, 2004

For: LOW NOISE SPROCKET

Group Art Unit 3683

Examiner Thomas W. Irvin

**REPLY**

Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated November 10, 2008, please consider the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 12, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamada (US 6,340,338). Examiner impermissibly points only to the “first run-on ramp” structural limitation and ignores its associated functional limitation of “the first run-on ramp configured to lift the outer link plate in a radial direction when the outer link plate is positioned laterally at the first tooth.” Examiner does likewise with respect to the second run-on ramp limitation. Examiner erroneously dismisses the relevance of the functional limitations in distinguishing over the prior art. Indeed, Examiner is not permitted to omit the functional limitations of a claim before determining patentability. Further, it is settled that functional limitations may impart structure to a claimed apparatus. In other